

1 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
2 United States Attorney  
3 District of Nevada  
4 J. Gregory Damm  
5 Nicholas D. Dickinson  
6 Assistant United States Attorneys  
7 333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000  
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
9 Telephone: (702) 388-6336  
10 Facsimile: (702) 388-5087

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

-oOo-

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,      }      2:09-CR-078-JCM-(RJJ)  
11      Plaintiff,                      }      2:10-CR-520-JCM-(RJJ)  
12      vs.                              }  
13      SHAWN RICE,                    }  
14      Defendant.                    }  
15

16      GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO  
17      DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO  
18      DISMISS DUE TO SPEEDY TRIAL  
19      ACT VIOLATION - CR # 258

16      COMES NOW the United States of America, by and through DANIEL G.  
17      BOGDEN, United States Attorney, and J. Gregory Damm and Nicholas D. Dickinson,  
18      Assistant United States Attorneys and hereby submits GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE  
19      TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT  
20      VIOLATION - CR # 258.

16      On March 3, 2009, defendant Rice was indicted and charged with one count of  
17      conspiracy to commit money laundering pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (h), thirteen  
18      counts of money laundering pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(3)(A), and aiding and  
19      abetting. On October 19, 2010, defendant Rice was indicted and charged with three  
20      counts of failure to appear in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 3146(a)(1). Defendant Rice was  
21      a fugitive from justice from March 8, 2010, until his arrest in Arizona on December 22,  
22      2011, a total of 654 days.

1           Defendant Rice contends that he was denied his right to a speedy trial under the  
 2 provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161. In his procedural background, defendant Rice refers  
 3 to the indictment in case # 2:09-CR-078-JCM-(RJJ) as his “first and only indictment”  
 4 and he neglects to mention the subsequent failure to appear indictment in case # 2:10-  
 5 CR-520-JCM-(RJJ). Defendant Rice appears to only raise his speedy trial argument  
 6 in his first case 2:09-CR-078-JCM-(RJJ). Defendant Rice claims that the speedy trial  
 7 clock began to run on March 6, 2009, the date of his initial appearance in the first case  
 8 (money laundering).

9           Defendant Rice appears to have ignored the provisions of 18 U.S.C. §  
 10 3161(k)(1) which provides as follows:

11           If the defendant is absent (as defined by subsection (h)(3)) on the day set  
 12 for trial, and the defendant's subsequent appearance before the court on  
 13 a bench warrant or other process or surrender to the court occurs more  
 14 than 21 days after the day set for trial, the defendant shall be deemed to  
 have first appeared before a judicial officer of the court in which the  
 information or indictment is pending within the meaning of subsection (c)  
 on the date of the defendant's subsequent appearance before the court.

15           The trial for the defendant shall commence 70 days after the latter: (1) the filing  
 16 date, or (2) the date that the defendant has appeared before the judicial officer in which  
 17 the charge is pending. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(c)(1). Because the defendant was gone for a  
 18 period of more than 21 days, § 3161(k)(1) requires that the speedy trial clock be reset  
 19 to zero. *See, United States v. Serrano*, 197 F. App'x 906, 908–09 (11th Cir.2006)  
 20 (unpublished) ("when the defendant is absent or unavailable at the date of his trial and  
 21 does not appear before the court within 21 days, § 3161(k)(1) resets the speedy trial  
 22 clock"); *United States v. Holloway*, 43 F.3d 712 (Table), 1 (D.C.Cir.1994)  
 23 (unpublished) (defendant was absent in excess of 21 days; thus, the Speedy Trial Act  
 24 clock was reset); *United States v. Robinson*, 991 F.2d 792 (Table), 2 (4th Cir.1993)  
 25 (unpublished) ("speedy trial clock began anew under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(k)(1)" after  
 26 defendant failed to appear and was absent for more than 21 days); *United States v.  
 Greo*, 1994 WL 163923 (S.D.N.Y.1994) (18 U.S.C. § 3161(k)(1) reset the speedy trial

1 clock to zero after defendant failed to appear for trial and was absent for longer than  
2 21 days). Further, because the defendant did not first appear where the charge was  
3 pending, the speedy trial clock did not commence to run until defendant Rice was  
4 returned to the district of Nevada. *See United States v. Thirion*, 813 F.2d 146, 153 (8th  
5 Cir.1987) (speedy trial clock does not start until first appearance in district where  
6 charge is pending, even though defendant in federal custody prior to that time). Since  
7 defendant Rice made his first appearance in the district of his arrest (Arizona), his  
8 speedy trial clock was not restarted under the Speedy Trial Act until his subsequent  
9 appearance in the charging district (Nevada) on January 19, 2012. CR # 220 in 2:09-  
10 CR-078-JCM-(RJJ).

11 On February 16, 2012, defendant Rice filed a Stipulation to Continue Trial. CR  
12 # 220. On February 20, 2012, this Court filed an Order to Continue Trial (CR # 230)  
13 which provided that time under the speedy trial clock was excluded from 3/13/12 until  
14 7/23/12. A similar order was entered in the failure to appear case (2:10-CR-520-JCM-  
15 (RJJ)) which excluded time under the speedy trial clock from 3/13/12 until 8/7/12. The  
16 two cases were consolidated on June 4, 2012. CR # 23 in 2:10-CR-520-JCM-(RJJ).

17 Under either case, 2:09-CR-078-JCM-(RJJ) or 2:10-CR-520-JCM-(RJJ), the  
18 defendant's right to a speedy trial within 70-days has not yet run. At most, 54-days  
19 have run from 1/19/2012 (initial appearance) to 3/13/2012 (first trial setting). The  
20  
21     ///  
22     ///  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 defendant stipulated to a continuance in the first case until 7/23/2012 and until  
2 8/7/2012 in the second case (failure to appear). The defendant's motion to dismiss for  
3 an alleged violation of the speedy trial act should be denied.

4

5 DATED this 16th day of July, 2012.  
6 Respectfully submitted,

7 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
8 United States Attorney

9 /s/ J. Gregory Damm

10 J. GREGORY DAMM  
11 Assistant United States Attorney

12 /s/ Nicholas D. Dickinson

13 NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON  
14 Assistant United States Attorney

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## Certificate of Service

2 I, Pamela Mrenak, hereby certify that I am an employee of the United  
3 States Department of Justice, and that on this day I served a copy of the following:  
4 **GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE**  
5 **TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT VIOLATION - CR # 258**, upon counsel for all defendants  
6 appearing in this matter via the CM/ECF system, by electronically filing said  
7 **GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE**  
8 **TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT VIOLATION - CR # 258** and mailing a copy postage  
9 prepaid to Shawn Talbot Rice, P.O. Box 1092, Seligman, Arizona 86337-1092 and to  
10 Shawn Talbot Rice, Inmate # 43739-048, Nevada Southern Detention Center, 2190 E.  
11 Mesquite Ave., Pahrump, NV 89060-3427.

13 Dated: July 16, 2012 /s/ Pamela J. Mrenak  
14 Legal Assistant to J. Gregory Damm  
Assistant United States Attorney  
District of Nevada